



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

resulted from the founding of the Academy, and the later fostering care of Louis XIV., that spirit of effective criticism usually exerted by literary men, even under absolutism, was repressed, and the attitude of the government in religious concerns had a like influence in crushing out whatever independence varying creeds might have given. If it is unjust to hold the cardinal responsible for the whole of this movement, it is as unfair to forget that he was its originator.

An exception may be made regarding religious matters, for Richelieu seems to have had no intention of depriving the Huguenots of their religious as distinct from their political independence. Although a cardinal, Richelieu was first of all a Frenchman, and it is more than possible that he expected this tolerance; united with the education which is gained from commercial relations as well as from books, to produce an enlightened community, a community in which more confidence could be placed and to which more powers could gradually be entrusted.

The work closes with a brief consideration of the "*Testament politique*," only the first chapter of which our author believes to be authentic, an all too short discussion of Richelieu's personal character, and a brief bibliography. As a whole the critic can only repeat of this book what its writer says of the work of M. Hanotaux, that it is to be hoped its author may yet find sufficient leisure to enlarge it.

C. H. LINCOLN.

Philadelphia.

---

*Studies in Ancient History; The Second Series; Comprising an Inquiry into the Origin of Exogamy.* By the late JOHN FERGUSON McLENNAN. Edited by his widow and ARTHUR PLATT. Pp. xiv, 605. Price, \$6.00. London and New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896.

Maine's "Ancient Law," and Bachofen's "*Mutterrecht*" were published in 1861. The first edition of McLennan's "Primitive Marriage" appeared in 1865. Morgan's "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family" was published in 1871, and his "Ancient Society" in 1877. The first edition of McLennan's "Studies in Ancient History; First Series; Comprising a Reprint of Primitive Marriage," was published in 1876, and his "The Patriarchal Theory," edited after the author's death by his brother, Donald McLennan, appeared in 1885. These dates are necessary to an appreciation of the great importance of the posthumous papers now published as a second series of the "Studies in Ancient History," a volume which has been reviewed in prominent journals in a grossly misleading way. Justice to one of the ablest and most unfortunate of constructive

thinkers upon that most difficult of sociological problems, the origin of marriage, demands that the new contribution towards its solution which is here made should be understood and recognized.

Maine's explanation of ancient law assumed the universal prevalence in prehistoric times of the patriarchal family, founded on the *patria potestas*, and limited by agnation. Bachofen's researches proved that the primitive systems of kinship traced descent through mothers instead of through fathers and tried to account for this fact by denying the truth of the patriarchal theory and assuming a primitive promiscuity in sexual relations, or perhaps a communism of women. McLennan brought great learning and critical insight to bear upon the question. Not then acquainted with the work of Bachofen, he independently discovered the primitive system of relationship through women, the widely observed rule of exogamy, and the prevalence of wife capture and of its surviving symbolism. These facts he accounted for by another widely extended practice, female infanticide, which he regarded as a cause of the other phenomena. Scarcity of food, he argued, compelled each little horde of primitive men to cut off its useless members, and the girl babies could most easily be spared. Scarcity of women, thus produced, led each horde to try to capture women from other hordes, and the captives were owned by their captors in common. Thus it came about that polyandry was the earliest form of marriage. Confirmation of this theory McLennan found in many practices that survived after polyandry ceased to exist, for example, the levirate of the Jews, or the law that a surviving brother must take to wife his deceased brother's widow.

Maine had been the first writer to understand the Grecian *γενος*, the Roman *gens*, and to appreciate its social and juristic importance. Lewis H. Morgan was the first investigator to discover that the totemic groups of the North American Indians, and of other uncivilized races, are in essential features organizations like the gens; that, in short, the totem-kin of the red man, the clan of the Celt, the gens of the Roman, and the hayy of the Arab, are one and the same organization. He was the first to distinguish clearly between the clan and the tribe, and the first to discover that it is the totem-kin, clan, or gens which is the exogamous organization. An attempt to reconcile these discoveries with the primitive systems of consanguinity and affinity led him to advance the hypothesis that the primitive relations of the sexes were neither promiscuous nor patriarchal, neither polyandrian only nor polygamous only, but were definite groupings in which each woman was a wife to several men and each man was a husband to several women.

With these facts before us we can understand the exact value of the

second series of McLennan's Studies. Since his death the critical researches of Post, Dargun, Starcke, Westermarck and other investigators have established the moral certainty that the primitive relations of the sexes were neither patriarchal nor so definitely organized in any other way as McLennan and Morgan seemed to suppose. It is highly probable that, as Darwin supposed, male power and jealousy established the pairing of one man with one woman as the usual relation, but that this mating was a very temporary affair, and left children to be cared for by the mother and to take her name. With this relation every other possible relation probably now and then coexisted, so that it was always a question of circumstance which form should gain ascendancy in any particular group. In a word, the primitive relations of the sexes were indefinite, uncertain and led to many forms of grouping.

Let the reader now turn to page 59 of this new volume of McLennan's papers and read a letter to Mr. Darwin, written by McLennan, February 3, 1874. All these results of criticism are there presented. McLennan himself had anticipated them all, and had accepted them. On the two main points his own words are these:

"Now I agree with you that from what we know of human nature we may be sure each man would aim at having one or more women to himself, and cases would occur wherein for a longer or shorter time the aim would be realized. . . . I take it, polygamy, monogamy and polyandry (or its equivalents) must have occurred in every district from the first, and grown up together into systems sanctioned by usage first and then by law."

But how, after writing this opinion, which subsequent investigation has confirmed, could McLennan continue to insist that marriage began in polyandry. The letter answers this question also, and for the first time shows exactly what his contention was. In his view polyandry was not the first relation of the sexes, but it was the first form of *marriage*—i. e., it was the first form of the sexual relation, which was *sanctioned by group opinion*. Again, to quote his own words, he says:

"Polyandry, in my view, is an advance *from*, and contraction of promiscuity. It gives men *wives*. Till men have wives they may have tastes, but they have no obligations in matters of sex. You may be sure that polygamy in the early stage never had the sanction of *group opinion*. They would all envy and grieve at the good of their polygamous neighbor. Polygamy, then, did not at first give men *wives*. Wifedom begins with polyandry, which is a contract."

Obviously there was here raised by Mr. McLennan, twenty-three years ago, a question absolutely distinct from that which students of

the history of the family have since, for the most part, been discussing. Obviously, too, Mr. McLennan's question is the sociologically important one. Marriage is more than a fact of physiology and more than a relatively enduring cohabitation. It is a socially sanctioned relation. Admitting that every possible grouping of the sexes may have been tried by primitive men, what grouping was the first to be socially sanctioned? Students who may now re-read McLennan's books in the light of this thought will at least admit that he has made out a strong case for polyandry.

This thought runs through these posthumous papers. It was a strange series of fatalities which kept them from the public for so many years. Most of them are incomplete. They are written as fragments of a great work on early society, which should have systematically presented the final results of the author's studies. After his death his brother tried to piece them together. While engaged in this task Mr. Donald McLennan also died, and the material passed into the hands of Robertson Smith. Before he had done anything with it his final illness overtook him. Mr. J. F. McLennan's widow then assumed the work, and when the result of her labors was finally in the printer's hands she, too, passed away.

The volume is in two parts. The first is theoretical and expository and includes excellent chapters on the nature of historical evidence, on the definition of terms, and on "Kinship, Totemism and Marriage," "The Origin of Exogamy," "Female Infanticide," "Exogamy Inferred from the Law of Succession," and "Examples of Fabricated Genealogies." The second part is a mass of descriptive facts from many parts of the world, of different degrees of value, according to the authorities followed.

FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS.

*Columbia University.*

---

*The Life of Richard Cobden.* By JOHN MORLEY. Two vols. Pp. 468, and 509. Price, \$3.00. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896.

The semi-centennial of the inauguration of England's free trade policy could not have been better commemorated than by the republication of these two volumes of Mr. Morley, containing the record of the life and deeds of Richard Cobden. This biography is of great interest for many reasons. It has been written by a past master in the art. Mr. Morley has followed here a method somewhat different from that adopted in his "Lives" of Voltaire, Diderot and Rousseau. Cobden's life and theories are described for the most part in his own words, extracted from letters, journals, speeches, articles and books. From these Americans will learn that Richard Cobden was not such a monster as he is generally portrayed to our political audiences by ignorant